DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 349 EA 007 988

AUTHOR McGowan, Francis, II
TITLE Collective Negotiations and the Subsequent Plight of the School Principal.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 23p.; Occasional light print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Collective Negotiation; Conflict Resolution; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Programs; Literature Reviews; *Principals; Role Conflict; Systems Approach; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Associations; Teacher Militancy
IDENTIFIERS Synergy

ABSTRACT

A synergetic approach to the principalship can ultimately benefit all parties involved in collective negotiations. The utilization of synergy (the cooperative interaction of the various elements of a system) can allow the principal to fulfill many functions instead of confining himself to a strictly defined (and, hence, restricted) role. He can function, for example, as change agent and as systems analyst, helping to smooth the negotiations process without abdicating his responsibility to his teachers and to quality education for his students. The role conflict experienced by the principal comes to the fore when instructional matters, such as class size, are issues for negotiation. The principal must mediate between his authority in such matters and teachers associations' desire for more decision-making power. Both teachers and the principal share the desire for improved instruction. This mutually held goal should take precedence over fragmented special interests. By regarding the negotiations process from the perspective of systems theory and synergy, the principal can transcend the adversarial relationship between teachers and administration, thus alleviating conflict. (DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Submitted in Free-lance by
Francis McGowan II
23 Boulevard
Cornwall-on-Hudson
New York 12520
Phone: (914) 534-8608
Soc. Sec. #: 045-34-3528

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Francis Mc Gowan II

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ED119349

Collective Negotiations and the Subsequent Plight of the School Principal

EA 007 988

© Francis McGowan II 1976

All Rights Reserved

Collective Negotiations and the Subsequent Plight of the School Principal

> The teacher today is better educated than he has ever been. He knows more...about his subject matter and about how a child lives and learns and grows....[He]...is younger in chronological age and in teaching experience than he was only a few years ago....
>
> No longer do these teachers consider teaching to be a calling separate from the mainstream of American life. It is no longer some kind of monastic order that sustains its breath on early vows of dedication....
>
> These young people are determined to do an effective job of teaching. They identify education as a great force for social betterment. And, when needed resources or support fail to come their way, they are not content to swallow their private dreams or their personal pride....
>
> They are determined to serve society and improve it through education; but they are also determined to do so at the same time they... enjoy the material and cultural advantages open to most Americans.[1]

Frederick Hipp, as Executive Secretary of the New Jersey Education Association continued:

> The American teacher is fashioning a new image for himself. He is becoming a respected professional determined to be involved in the creative enterprise called the school system. This changing image reveals the teacher as capable and eager to face the issues of the day, aware of his own sense of destiny. By his teaching he helps shape the world of tomorrow. Decision-making, self-direction, instructional innovation, civic and social leadership--these are all a part of the changing face of teaching.[2]

Concurrently existing with this perception of the emerging, socially-minded, young and idealistic educator is the prevailing problem shared by virtually all educators: That of being bombarded by various public groups demanding that teachers and the schools solve, in short order, many of the problems which are, in effect, odious manifestations of serious societal dislocations. Those teachers being so "attacked" and challenged are gathering forces and reacting. Witness:

> In all school districts--big city, suburban, and rural--teachers are now being subjected to considerable stress and strain. Parent groups, civic associations, and civil rights advocates focus a searchlight on the schools and the teacher....Miracles are now being expected of our teachers and our schools....
>
> The schools are in ferment...[and teachers]...are concerned with their lot....They want a dignity and self-respect on a par with employees working for private business corporations.
>
> [Therefore, the]...teacher, in concert with his colleagues, is now mobilizing collective strength through a revitalized and "scrappy" National Education Association or through the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO,

> the teacher "union." The voices of teachers are growing more articulate. Teachers demand an opportunity to improve their professional and economic status as well as working conditions. Through their employee organizations, teachers hope to find an almost equal voice with boards of education and school superintendents in developing educational policies.[3]

Many reasons are proposed for the rising mobilization of teacher strength, and all seem to be mutually reinforcing:

> ...the rising militancy of teachers is a response to pressures from the public, pressures that take the form of a hue and cry over educational deficiencies. Teachers are called on to solve many problems that they lack the power and financial means to deal with (e.g., integration, pupil failure, and the general disintegration of the social fabric). In their frustration they have turned to direct action.[4]

This "direct action" has been labelled differently by various writers, but in general--

> The demand of teachers for recognition and participation has...been put in the framework of the emergence of teacher restiveness or...aggressiveness; and sometimes it has been characterized as the emergence of teacher militancy.[5]

Teacher militancy has led to demands on the part of teachers that boards of education be compelled by law to negotiate or "bargain" directly with representatives of teachers' groups on such matters of concern as salaries, reduction of class size, fringe benefits, duty-free lunch periods, relief from non-professional chores, and grievance procedures. But as a result of new inputs to the profession and a common concern, these original areas of negotiation have been expanded to include in-service education, leaves of absence, curriculum revision, teaching assignments, transfers and promotions, discharge and discipline of teachers, and the provision and securement of physical facilities in the district.[6] Benson and Dunn have logically concluded that "When the list of teachers' concerns is thus broadened, it is apparent that some teachers now define 'working conditions' to include the most fundamental matters of policy decision in a school district."[7]

Teacher militancy has also led to the legal recognition of representative teachers' groups, compelling or authorizing local boards of education to enter into "collective bargaining," "professional negotiations," or "collective negotiations" with teacher's organizations; these "comprehensive statutes" denote the obligations of school boards and the rights of teacher organizations in regard to the negotiation process. Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware have summarized some of the code citations, and made a comparison of the statutory mediation and appeal procedures in many states.[8] These authorities point out, too, that "Negotiations are being carried on, and agreements being signed or adopted as board policy in

almost every state in the United States."[9]

Elam, Lieberman, and Moskow observe that

> Such negotiations are a recent phenomenon....In 1960, not a single state authorized or required collective negotiations between teachers and school boards. By June, 1967, such legislation had been introduced in almost half the states....Legislation authorizing such negotiations seems certain to be enacted in several other states in the immediate future.[10]

In the minds of some, there are semantic difficulties to be resolved in talking of "collective bargaining" or "professional negotiations," and the differences between the two have become a source of conflict between the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers and their respective state and local affiliates.[11] Michael H. Moskow has portrayed some of these sources of conflict as debated by Carl Megel of the AFT and Mrs. Marion Street of the NEA, and advocates the use of the term, "collective negotiations" as a compromise.[12] He points out that

> In terms of the effect upon school administration, no significant differences between the approaches of the NEA and the AFT seem discernible.... When negotiations are conducted by either of the two organizations, essentially the same problems arise, and the participants assume essentially the same roles. And even the general tenor of negotiating sessions seems very similar.[13]

For purposes of this paper, the term "collective negotiations" will be used, and defined as:

> ...a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local... [teachers' group]...and the school board, which provides an orderly method for the school board and the local...[group]...to negotiate...on matters of mutual concern, to reach agreement on those matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of impasse.[14]

Put simply:

> In...[collective]...negotiations, associations represent their teacher-members in across-the-table bargaining with boards of education or their duly appointed representatives. The negotiation culminates in a written agreement, a contract which sets forth who teaches, how he teaches, and under what conditions.[15]

In support of the collective negotiation procedure, Herndon and Law state emphatically their belief that teachers should not be coerced into accepting arbitrarily imposed conditions of professional practice, that teachers are the best authority--and the only authority--on matters such as wages and conditions which are satisfactory to them.[16]

With the advent of such developments in education comes a sometimes nightmarish-like dilemma for many school principals. Herein, a degree of dissolution

of unilateral authority may be seen, and although the positions of the board members and the teachers seem relatively clear in relation to collective negotiations, the positions of officials at various administrative levels within a given school system are sometimes by no means clear at all.[17] There is frustration and a deep unrest among not a few principals, who see collective negotiations taking place around, but rarely with, them; it is a rare negotiating team which includes a principal or any representative of school system "middle management."[18]

The problem for school principals, particularly among the smaller districts, is further compounded not only by the nature of the negotiation process itself, but by the positions taken by the AFT and the NEA in regard to administrative involvement in that process. Perry and Wildman state: "The AFT's position is clear--the exclusion of administrative personnel from classroom teacher organizations and bargaining units is preferred."[19] They maintain that this position is based on the private industry, conflict-of-interest model of supervisor-supervised relationships; that this conflict-of-interest stems mainly from the power over sanctions which the supervisor has traditionally held; and, that this power implies a status difference within the organization, resulting in gaps in the structure.[20] The NEA's position is the more recent lenient in regards to administrative involvement in the negotiation process, but may based on a fallacious assumption. Instead of having the conflict-of-interest model as its foundation:

> The NEA's predominant position can be said to reflect the public service or identity-on-interest model. Public employees, particularly teachers, are judged to share with their superiors an identification with the service performed and this identification...forms the basis for a common interest between supervised and supervisor which overrides any differences between them.[21]

In regard to the conflict-of-interest model vs. the identity-of-interest model, Luvern Cunningham states:

> Although...most professional negotiation agreements allow for a merging if administrative and teaching personnel as a single negotiating unit vis-a-vis the board of education, a more radical cleavage between "labor" and "management" seems to be emerging.[22]

To add to this dilemma, many authoritative positions taken regarding the principal's role in the negotiation process are confusing and contradictory. Myron Lieberman, for example, believes that principals must represent management if they are to participate in negotiations; they must represent the board of education and not classroom teachers or an organization comprised mainly of classroom

teachers.[23] Recognizing that principals do not follow the foregoing in many situations, he also states that restrictions will have to be placed on administrative membership in organizations which negotiate on behalf of teachers.[24] He does point out, however, that

> ...it is a mistake to think of principals as a homogeneous class of educational employees....One must look to the occupationsl situation, not the label, to determine their status in an intelligent way.[25]

Epstein and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, on the other hand, indicate strongly that no professional negotiations should be entered into without the involvement of principals.[26] Epstein explains some of his objections to agreements reached between teachers' groups and boards of education without the involvement of principals in his paper, "The NASSP and Collective Negotiations."[27] He views any misunderstandings or suspicions existing presently between teachers and their administrators as a consequence of the infancy of the collective negotiation process, and holds that during the maturing process, principals do not want "...to get stuck by the diaper pins."[28]

Other authorities, however, contend that principals should take part in the negotiation process as official representatives of all-inclusive teachers' organizations.[29] According to Olson, principals at present do not receive much insight into any uniform perception of their role vis-a-vis collective negotiations by examining legal and comprehensive statutes, leading to further role confusion. For example, of those states having legislation pertaining to collective action on the part of teachers as public employees, only Rhode Island specifically prohibits the participation of principals. The Michigan statute, however, is also interpreted by the Michigan Labor Relations Board as prohibiting principals' participation. Wisconsin holds that supervisors are agents of the employer, but does not prohibit principals from joining teachers' organizations. The Connecticut statute provides for associations to vote on whether or not supervisors should be included in the negotiating unit. All other state statutes are generally silent on the principal's role. In some states, specifications mandate that negotiation can include any certified personnel except the chief administrative officer (Washington), the superintendent (Oregon), or those elected by popular vote or appointed by a governor (California). In Nashville, Tennessee, principals are represented on a joint negotiation team.[30]

Olson continues:

> Associations themselves, while embracing administrators as members, have not made any serious attempts to define the principal's role in the nego-

tiation process. The record shows that, by and large, associations have evaded the problem by ignoring the principal.[31]

Olson further states that the Department of Elementary School Principals (now the NAESP), NEA, passed a resolution at its spring convention in 1966 critical of guidelines and statutes placing principals under supervisory categories, and critical of local associations which succeeded in securing collective negotiation rights and then excluded principals as either members of the association or as members of the negotiating unit.[32]

What are the initial reactions of principals to this confusion and exclusion? Before citing these, one must attempt to form an hypothetical base for such reactions and it must be stated emphatically that any apparent points of contention would seem to exist not primarily in the area of remuneration, but rather in those areas of negotiations having to do with the instructional program, and administrative prerogative in that regard. Perry and Wildman suggest conflict questions having to do with: Class size; seniority as it pertains to class assignments, promotions, and transfers; principal's judgment regarding teaching assignments based upon ability and contribution to the overall school program; the length of the teaching day; and, the length and frequency of faculty meetings.[33]

This view is supported by Watson, who states, "...research has indicated that teachers are particularly desirous of assuming responsibility for decisions which relate to instruction and curriculum areas...."[34] He contends that teachers are actively seeking legitimation of their authority to make educational decisions and that such legitimation will necessarily result in a shifting of power arrangements between and among hierarchical authority levels within the school organization.[35] This shift of power will frequently lead to conflict.[36]

Perry and Wildman observe that with teachers' views being accepted and regulations being formulated, administrative flexibility and discretion will be lost; the school principal will lose the freedom to exercise his judgment in regard to instructional program matters.[37] Watson suggests that the result of power realignments stemming from collective negotiations will cause the principals to lose power; his/her discretion will be curbed; and, that many principals resent this curbing of their discretionary powers.[38]

Herein lies an hypothetical basis for the immediate reactions of many principals to their externally-imposed exclusion from the area of collective negotiations. Subsequently, Cunningham reported that, due to the altered prin-

cipal-teacher relationships caused by teacher militancy and collective negotiations, principals for the most part felt that it would be more difficult for them to supervise the instructional program, and that the search for power among teachers was an attempt to usurp the prerogatives of the principal; some principals viewed the developments as threats to their authority and autonomy.[39] Cunningham even suggested that agreements concerning work rules reached in collective negotiations were the source of increased frustration, if not panic, for the principal.[40]

Cunningham has provided not only a view of some initial reactions to the principal's predicament, but an insight into the implications of these reactions as he performs his duties and accepts his responsibilities. Cunningham points out, as others have done, the two authority structures in the school: First, the positional authority resulting from legal delegation and the placement of the position in the organizational chart; second, the informal or sanctional authority which is the result of interaction within or between informal subsystems existing in each school.[41] Since by collective negotiations a measure of the principal's formal authority is being modified, he would do well to concentrate on obtaining sanctional authority within the "individual school social system" of which he is principal. This implication is reinforced by Cunningham's statement regarding the legal position of the principal in collective negotiations: "...the principal stands out in bold relief as the man-in-the-middle."[42]

Cunningham asserts that the principal who views his authority as vested almost totally in the office will feel considerably more threatened by teacher militancy and non-involvement in the negotiation process than the principal who possesses a sanctional-professional orientation toward his position and role.[43] Such a principal would serve to negate, to some degree, the charge that collective negotiations will permit and enable teachers to undermine administrative authority.[44]

In developing his viewpoint in regard to sanctional authority, Cunningham relies upon Erickson's models concerning roles of the principal; Erickson, while describing these models, denounces the "instructional leader" role as being too static a typology for today's principal who must survive in an ever-increasingly dynamic society.[45] Erickson describes six images which principals seem to have of themselves and sets forth the effects that collective negotiations might have on each image.[46] The first image is that of the prin-

cipal as housekeeper. This principal has a smoothly operating building, with neat and clean surroundings. Because of this primary concern, the housekeeper would seem to be little moved, positively or negatively, by collective negotiations.

The second image of the principal is that of the paternalistic. This principal is the protector of teachers and the defender of the school. He would be more than mildly upset by collective negotiations, because the teachers would no longer require his protective services, and hence, might deal a shattering blow to his ego.

The third image is that of the principal as super-teacher. This principal would be torn between the bureaucratic and collegial systems and hence would be incompatible with teacher militancy. This contention seems to reinforce Ericksen's view that the "instructional leader" principal tends to make the position static.

The foreman is the fourth image of the principal. Here the principal is faced with pledging allegiance to either superordinates or subordinates; hence, his position in the face of collective negotiations would seem a dilemma at best. He is placed squarely in the middle of the Getzels and Guba conceptualization of administration within the school social system.[47] Further, Argyris has pointed out the lack of congruency between formal institutional demands and the individual's needs.[48] The foreman principal is indeed in a predicament in regard to collective negotiations.

The fifth image of the principal is that of change-agent. He is knowledgeable about new developments in education, and seeks, through working within the social subsystems of the school, to implement as many new ideas as he can. This principal need not necessarily adhere to the approaches to change as put forth by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley, but he must certainly be aware that these approaches exist (i.e., changing distributions of power, finding new ways to mobilize energy, and correcting patterns of communication).[49] And, he must certainly recognize the client systems--the personality system, the group, the organization (for which he is largely responsible), and the community--within which he must operate.[50] The change-agent principal will probably fare comparatively well in the face of collective negotiations, for his actions will necessarily be based on his perception and diagnosis of those conceptual elements which determine the dynamics of the school social system and the other

systems within which he interacts. His leadership capability need not be compromised to the extent that he feels threatened by the negotiation process.

The sixth image is that of the principal as a systems-analyst. The systems-analyst has the skills necessary to allow him to develop a rationale concerning organizational behavior and he possesses a good degree of sophistication in understanding performance levels and feedback mechanisms. With such ability, this principal would probably not feel threatened by collective negotiations. He would be able to develop a personal administrative model of behavior as a result of teacher participation in decision-making. In effect, he would seriously attempt to answer the question:

> How do I adjust the role of myself and others...to the new process so that I maintain fully effective avenues for the exercise of professional and administrative leadership which it is my obligation to provide?[51]

The implications of this discussion for the school principal seem quite clear: He should attempt to adjust his administrative behavior to be in accord with the change-agent and systems-analyst images, and in developing such skills as are required, never really conceptualize his role outside of the framework of the school social systems structure. The improvement of the instructional program should be the the principal's internalized objective, and the change-agent and systems-analyst images viewed as favorable means of achieving this objective in light of rising teacher militancy and the reality of collective negotiations.

In support of these contentions, the following is offered: As a result of an attempt at collaborative leadership held at the University of Chicago's Center for Continuing Education in 1967, it was found that any objectives concerned with joint or intergroup efforts required re-examination in light of developing and changing perceptions. Therefore, it was recommended that primar efforts directed toward the establishment of collaborative leadership--seemingl an objective of teacher organizations in collective negotiations--focus on thos areas which permit flexible models of interaction without retrogression into rigidified role perceptions.[52]

The school principal would do well to heed that recommendation and realize that

> ...if the administrator, despite the necessity to share through... [collective negotiations]...some measure of previously unilaterally exercised authority, is ultimately responsible for representing his and the organization's interests in the new relationship and plays an indispensable role within the...mechanism through which power is

> to be shared, his status and functional potential within the organization are more likely to be enhanced than eroded.[53]

Watson, in his article, "The Principal: Forgotten Man in Negotiations," concurs:

> It is...reasonable to assume that the ability of principals to survive and flourish in the decades ahead will depend on their capacity to adapt to new circumstances such as those represented by the shifting of power within the school....The principal who has drawn his authority solely from the nature of his office, rather than from professional and personal sources, will have difficulty surviving in the authority structure....[This] dictates asking himself how he can adjust his role in order that he may maintain effective avenues for the exercise of professional and administrative leadership.[54]

It should be noted, however, that a disturbing phenomenon has occurred here. In following the development of images of the principal in the context of teacher militancy and collective negotiations, and in examining the implications of such an analysis for administrative behavior, it may be, alas, readily observed that most research and/or authoritative statement on the subject seems to have dealt with various ways a principal might <u>react</u>, or <u>readjust</u>, his role perceptions in light of emerging power realignments within a given school social system. Virtually nothing has been said of the principal who might choose to <u>act</u> in regard to collective negotiations and power realignments rather than to simply react. Reaction seems to connote a passivity on the part of the reactor, and such thinking, carried to its logical conclusion, might falsely indict school principals as lethargic entities within the school social system capable of little or no action themselves.

As a counter to such thinking, and to strike a blow for the action-oriented principal, it may be that a new typology, or image, of principal is in order. This image should be capable of encompassing all standard typologies mentioned above, and simultaneously capable of providing the lacking thrust. It must also seek to provide the school principal with <u>access</u> to the process of collective negotiations, regardless of formal, institutionalized perceptions of the principalship. To paraphrase Arthur Lewis: In a sense, access is the heart of the American experience. Have we succeeded in providing, through existing images, access to school principals? The existing evidence would seem to point to the unequivocal answer of, "No."[55]

In order to help provide such access, and to include positive features of already cited images, it might be proposed that one think in terms of not

only a change-agent principal, nor a systems-analyst principal, but in terms of the synergistic principal. To explain: According to system theory, the individual school may be viewed as a complex of elements and forces in mutual interaction.[56] This system may be broken down and exposed as an aggregate of various subsystems. The school principal is subject to forces and elements within the subsystems and the individual system of the school; he is also a part of, and subject to, those forces and elements which constitute the school's supra and suprasuprasystems, i.e., the central office regime and the community power structure.[57] Indeed, the systems-analysis approach to the principalship would provide for such a view of schools and school systems, but the inference drawn from this image in regard to administrative behavior is one of accommodation to the existing interacting forces and elements. It is an "effect" approach to administrative behavior, if you will, rather than a "cause" approach.

The change-agent image, while admittedly providing for a redistribution of power, a changing of patterns of communication, and a vitalizing of potential energy, may, on the other hand, be viewed solely as a "cause" approach to administrative behavior, rather than as an "effect" approach. In fact, and herein lies some danger, change may to a degree become the end of the change-agent principal, and not just a means to an objective such as the improvement of the instructional program. In short, then, a synergetic approach to the principalship might perform a union function between the change-agent image and the systems-analyst image, and the result manifest in a dynamic entity capable of dealing within the various system and subsystem structures because of a broadened base of personal resource.

What is synergy? How may the concept of synergy contribute to the principalship?

> A synergy refers to the cooperative interaction of the various elements of a system. The underlying principle...provides that the gains of coordinated action are greater than the sum of the independent efforts of the separate elements.[58]

Taken in the broadest sense, the concept of synergy may provide for a supplemental relationship between the individual synergistic principal and those constituting the collective negotiation system, with the symbiotic aim of improving both the instructional program and the negotiation process.

As a means of pragmatically explaining the synergetic principalship, it is necessary to think in terms of systems theory. One must also assume the

reality and advantages of informal subsystems of organization existing within any formally defined social systems. First, the characteristics of synergy will be set down, and then, by means of applying various possible administrative behavioral approaches to the problems arising from "poor areas for negotiation" as set forth in Rudman's "The Dirty Dozen, the Principal, and His Teachers," an attempt will be made to demonstrate that within a synergetic frame of reference, the principal may be able to maintain his ability to function effectively even within the constraints imposed on his prerogatives by the collective negotiation process.[59]

Rubin depicts the characteristics of synergy as follows:

1. The end objectives [of a synergy]--the anticipated output--of the [system] must order and direct the operations of the [system] and be understood and accepted by each person in the organization who can contribute to their achievement.
2. Wherever possible, objectives must be set forth as explicit goals which permit a reasonably accurate assessment of accomplishment.
3. Sub-goals and end-goals, short and long term procedures, and unilateral and multilateral forces, all must be coordinated into a grand design which encourages the [system] to generate maximum momentum and to work toward its objectives systematically.
4. Means for achieving the goals must be specified.
5. Criteria for assessing the extent to which goals have been achieved must be specified.
6. A continuous effort must be made to search out contradictions in the system to institute corrective measures.
7. The organization must seek operating patterns which promote the job satisfaction of its personnel.[60]

The emphasis here seems to lie in stating and clarifying system objectives, and in this area the synergetic principal can do well. This point of emphasis was stated earlier in a short discussion of collaborative leadership, so in effect, is merely being reiterated. How may the school principal relate internalization of the above characteristics of synergy to the circumscriptions imposed upon him by collective negotiation constraints?

Let us examine some of Rudman's "Dirty Dozen," and, by the utilization of system theory and synergetic rationalization, attempt to institute an "action" approach to administrative problems. The following are cited by Rudman as being poor areas for negotiation: Textbook selection and use; curriculum improvement; achievement and intelligence testing; school size and district organization; class size; the number of teachers' meetings to be scheduled during a semester or a year (and the hours and days during which they may be called); report card

grading; emergency weather conditions; teacher participation on professional committees; personnel assignments and transfers; discipline; and the building representative and his role in administration.[61]

Rudman maintains that contract agreements dealing with textbook selection and use will prescribe a course of educational study, and that this prescription will of necessity lead to restriction. He also states that by bringing textbook selection within the purview of those in the negotiation process, the educational program of a community is being dangerously exposed to the politics of education.[62,63] Here is the implication for the synergetic principal: To dissuade unilateral political involvement and decision-making, the principal should do his utmost to communicate the negative consequences of irresponsible and biased action to those who will participate in the negotiation system selection process, on both sides. By applying the principles underlying the first, third, and sixth characteristics of synergy, the principal may be able to do much to insure that if textbook selection is indeed to be a part of the collective negotiation process, then the process in this regard will not be simply a rubber stamp for certain political forces, nor the fuel for fire from other sources, with differing viewpoints. This type of action on the part of the principal represents not only social system involvement within one school, but universal, community system involvement. The challenge here to the principal is great, but the dastardly consequences of inaction could be destructive to the instructional program of every school within the community setting. This situation has been apparent most recently in the Kanawha County Schools, Charleston, West Virginia.

Curriculum improvement is seen by Rudman as being a high priority item, but he rightly wonders how a dynamic school principal will be able to move to improve curricular offerings within the constraints of contracts stipulating the number of meetings which the teacher is obliged to attend.[64] If such participation does not provide the time or climate for curriculum improvement then the principal must seek alternate solutions to the problem. He might communicate his feelings in this regard to superordinates and concerned subordinates, and, incorporating the fourth characteristic of synergy, work for the institution of such measures as summer curriculum improvement workshops. This is admittedly a simplistic approach to the problem, and may do little in the way of upgrading existing shortcomings, but to be future-oriented is

better than to be frustrated in regard to curriculum improvement. Such action on the part of the principal might also do much to embody the seventh characteristic of synergy.

Rudman's objection to the scheduling of achievement and intelligence testing is that such scheduling destroys the flexibility necessary for system balance and maintenance, and makes the achievement of consensus among faculty members imperative.[65] The synergetic principal might here incorporate the sixth characteristic of synergy; he should seek out contradictions in the system and move to institute corrective measures. Why believe in and fight for openness in one subsystem and yet seek simultaneously to close others, especially when even test standardization takes into account in most instances certain time limit accommodations which need be imposed in particular schools for any number of reasons? The synergetic principal may be dissatisfied with rigidity as is pointed out by collective agreements providing for strict scheduling, but he need not be the only dissatisfied party. If indeed he relies on sanctional authority, then his chances of producing within his own faculty subsystem the same dissatisfaction will be greatly increased. The result may be the only input to the collective negotiation process necessary to bring about a limited mobilization of energy directed away from "closed system" thinking.

Rudman's rationale in objecting to class size contract stipulations seems to be based on his concern for flexibility in classroom and building organization; innovations such as team teaching and modular grouping will suffer as administrative strategies for organizing children (students) for instruction. He also points out that research has not determined whether students learn better or more as a result of the class size factor alone.[66] The synergetic principal might do well to operate <u>initially</u> as though a standard classroom organization permeated the thinking of most elements within the faculty subsystem, and that the responsibility of each teacher in regard to that model of thinking be respected. However, in terms of articulating instructional objectives, the principal might incorporate synergistic thinking into his own behavior and move to innovate while recognizing the basic constancy of the "classroom size quota responsibility." Moreover, if one considers the fifth characteristic of synergy, it should be clear that the principal carries a great deal of responsibility in terms of providing instruc-

tional leadership. If he abdicates this responsibility, then he may be responsible for any subsequent class size provisions in formal agreements.

If the principal finds it possible to operate a school with an organizational climate conducive to synergy, then contract stipulations in regard to the number and time of teachers' meetings may not appear so threatening. It may be recognized that much business can be conducted under the aegis of the various subsystems existing within the school social system. The synergetic principal should recognize this, and attempt to disprove findings dealing with the principal's lack of knowledge of informal relationships among staff members.[67]

In regard to school building and district organization, Rudman's point that specific formulae for organizing the school day and specific descriptions of building and system-wide professional councils will lead to a stifling of administrative creativity is well taken.[68] Such constraints, however, will also lead to a challenge, especially regarding the third characteristic of synergy and the definition of synergy itself. How does the principal provide an organizational climate conducive to maximum system momentum in the face of binding agreements which spell out specific methodology for achieving that end?

In reporting to parents, Rudman maintains that the administrator should be entitled to intervene in the teacher-pupil relationship as a protective measure against teacher whim or eccentricity.[69] This point is valid, but the implication for the principal is that he operate as one of the dynamic elements in a two-way subsystem defined as the teacher under consideration and himself before marking has been completed and reported. In a way that cannot be overemphasized, it should be stated that this subsystem must encompass every characteristic of synergy, for it is a crucial subsystem, and a breakdown here could result in a gradual breakdown of the entire social system of the entire school.

By examining some of the "Dirty Dozen" within a frame of reference which includes system theory and synergy, the principal may find it possible to conceptualize his role not as simply change-agent or as systems-analyst, foreman or housekeeper, "Daddy" or super-teacher, but as a combination of the best in all of these. Such a conceptualization leads to the advent of the synergetic principal--thrust oriented, capable of dynamic interaction within,

or just on the periphery of, the collective negotiation process, which is, after all, the manifestation of only another human social subsystem.

In the final analysis, the principal might attempt to alleviate any conflict resulting from the collective negotiation process on synergetic, or synonymously, synergistic, grounds, utilizing the appropriate personal and normative, rather than authoritarian or positional, power. Collective negotiations can represent a creative challenge to administration. "It does not necessarily represent a less satisfying or important role for administrators in the future."[70] As Olson points out:

> It is, after all, the welfare of the child which is ultimately at stake, and it is very unlikely that the child is best served in school systems where classroom teachers and principals...feel that they are adversaries. Teacher-principal conflict anywhere is undesirable, but in a given school building it is tragic. Professional staffs must avoid conflict as much as possible, but especially in their day-to-day work with their students. Where principals and teachers are partners, the task is much easier.[71]

Footnotes

[1]Frederick L. Hipp, "The Challenge to Leadership in Solving Problems of State Associations," Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Edu-tion, ed. Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, Michael H. Moskow (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1967), pp. 256-257.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Edward B. Shils and C. Taylor Whittier, Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining (N.Y.: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), p. 2.

[4]Charles S. Benson and Lester A. Dunn, "Employment Practices and Working Conditions," Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3 (June, 1967), p. 274. See also: NEA Research Division, "Strikes and Sanctions," National Education Association Journal, Vol. LVI (October, 1967), pp. 38-39.

[5]T.M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education (N.Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1966), p. 3.

[6]Benson and Dunn, p. 274.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Professional Negotiation in Public Education, pp. 48-55.

[9]Ibid., p. 56.

[10]Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, p. 1.

[11]Myron Lieberman and Michael Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers--An Approach to School Administration (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966).

[12]"Teacher Organizations: An Analysis of the Issues," Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, pp. 234-247.

[13]Ibid., pp. 236-237.

[14]Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware, p. 57, citing Guidelines for Professional Negotiation, rev. ed., Washington, D.C.: Office of Professional Development and Welfare, National Education Association, 1965, p. 1. (sic)

[15]Robert Kowalczyk, "The Teacher's Advocate," Today's Education, Vol. 58, No. 1 (January, 1969), p. 53.

[16]Terry E. Herndon and Kenneth Law, "Every Teacher's Responsibility," Today's Education, Vol. 58, No. 1 (January, 1969), p. 60.

[17]Luvern L. Cunningham, "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, p. 302.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Wesley A. Wildman and Charles R. Perry, "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLVII (January, 1966), p. 247.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid.

[22]"Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," p. 303.

[23]In Allen Dale Olson, "The Principal and Professional Negotiations," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLVI, No. 5 (April, 1967), p. 31.

[24]Myron Lieberman, "The Impact of Collective Negotiations upon Teacher-Administrator Relationships," Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, p. 233.

[25]Ibid., p. 232.

[26]Olson, p. 31.

[27]Benjamin Epstein, Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, pp. 185-195.

[28]Ibid., p. 19[illegible].

[29]Olson, p. 31.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p. 32.

[32]Ibid.

[33]"Group Conflict and School Organization," p. 250.

[34]Bernard C. Watson, "The Principal: Forgotten Man in Negotiations," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. XV, No. 2 (October, 1966), p. 1.

[35]Ibid., p. 2.

[36]Ibid.

[37]"Group Conflict and School Organization," p. 250.

[38]Watson, p. 3.

[39]"Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," pp. 299-300.

[40]Ibid., p. 303.

[41]Ibid., pp. 301-302.

[42]Ibid., p. 303.

[43]Ibid., p. 305.

[44]Henry R. Weinstock and Paul L. Van Horn, "Impact of Negotiations Upon Public Education," The Clearing House, Vol. 43, No. 6 (February, 1969), p. 358.

[45]"Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," p. 306, citing Donald A. Erickson, "Forces for Change in the Principalship," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. XLV (November, 1964), pp. 57-64.

[46]Donald A. Erickson, "The Principal as Administrator," 1966. (Mimeographed.) As cited in Ibid., pp. 306-308.

[47]Jacob W. Getzels and Egon Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, LXV (Winter, 1957), 423-441, as cited in Ralph B. Kimbrough, Administering Elementary Schools (N.Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1968), pp. 34-35.

[48]Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), as cited in Kimbrough, p. 34.

[49]Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley, The Dynamics of Planned Change (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), p. 48, as cited in Kimbrough, p. 115.

[50]Ibid., p. 117.

[51]Wesley A. Wildman, "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 46, No. 4 (December, 1964), p. 155.

[52]Rita L. Stafford and Kenneth J. Dunn, "Collaborative Leadership in Education," School and Society, Vol. 97, No. 2318 (Summer, 1969), p. 296.

[53]Wildman, p. 155.

[54]Administrator's Notebook, p. 4.

[55]"The Future of the Elementary School Principalship," Professional Negotiation and the Principalship (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969), p. 4.

[56]Kimbrough, p. 4, citing Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, NSSE 63rd Yearbook, ed. Daniel Griffiths (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 116.

[57]Ibid., pp. 5-7, citing James G. Miller, "Living Systems: Basic Concepts," Behavioral Science, X (July, 1965), 215.

[58]Louis J. Rubin, "Synergetics and the School," The Record (November, 1966), p. 128. (Teachers College, Columbia University)

[59]Herbert C. Rudman, "The Dirty Dozen, the Principal, and His Teachers," Professional Negotiation and the Principalship, pp. 61-80.

[60]Rubin, pp. 130-132.

[61]"The Dirty Dozen, the Principal, and His Teachers," p. 63.

[62]Ibid., p. 64. See also: Ken M. Young, "School Storm Centers--Charleston," Phi Delta Kappan, (December, 1974), pp. 262-264, 266-267. (sic)

[63]Mary A. Hepburn, "A Case Study of Creeping Censorship, Georgia Style," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 9 (May, 1974), pp. 611-613.

[64]"The Dirty Dozen...," pp. 64-66.

[65]Ibid., pp. 66-67.

[66]Ibid., pp. 68-70.

[67]James B. Burr et al., Elementary School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963), p. 157, as cited in Kimbrough, p. 236.

[68]"The Dirty Dozen...," pp. 67-68.

[69]Ibid., pp. 70-71.

[70]Benson and Dunn, p. 274.

[71]"The Principal and Professional Negotiations," p. 32.